

Advisory Committee Meeting

July 23, 2003, 6:00-8:00 p.m.

Illahee Elementary School Gymnasium 19401 SE 1st Street Camas, Washington 98607

Summary

Attendees:

- Commander Tony Barnes, Clark County Sheriff's Office
- Nancy Bjornsen, English Property
- Joni Kartchner, Neighbor
- David Lampe, Rinker Materials
- Reg Martinson, Evergreen School District
- Pat Nelson, Columbia Rock and Aggregates,
- David Nierenberg, Neighbor
- Jim Schmid, George Schmid and Sons, Inc.
- Bob Short, Glacier Northwest, Inc.
- Judy Teitzel, Friberg Property
- Alex Veliko, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation Commission

Staff:

- Peter Coffey, DKS Associates
- Karyn Criswell, The JD White Company, Inc. (TWC)
- Don Hanson, Otak, Inc.
- Mike Mabrey, Clark County
- Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver
- Jessica Stalberger, TWC
- John White, TWC

Public:

- Harry Friberg
- Carol Jellev
- James Jelley
- Stacey Johnson
- Jeff Mize, The Columbian
- Sarah Munson
- Heidi Olsen
- Bill Stewart, The Oregonian
- Sharon Story
- Ron Wamberg

Meeting Start-up

Mike Mabrey, Clark County, welcomed attendees to the meeting and thanked everyone for being there. He also thanked Advisory Committee members for committing their time to this process.

Karyn Criswell, The JD White Company, Inc. introduced herself and explained her role as the meeting facilitator.

Advisory Committee members introduced themselves and explained the interests they represent in the outcome of Section 30:

Reg Martinson, Evergreen School District, explained that the school district has schools adjacent to the northwest and southeast corners of Section 30 and is very interested in what is developed in these areas. Jim Schmid represents George Schmid and Sons, Inc. David Lampe represents Rinker Materials, Commander Tony Barnes represents the Clark County Sheriff's Department,

which operates a target range in Section 30. Joni Kartchner is a neighbor to the north of Section 30 and represents residential neighbors. She said she would like to see something similar to Orenco Station developed in Section 30. Mike Mabrey, Clark County, explained that he will oversee the consultants and manage the process. Jessica Stalberger, TWC, will coordinate the Advisory Committee meetings and take notes at the meetings. Don Hanson, Otak, said his role consists of data collection, development of the base maps, and development of the alternatives for the area. John White, TWC, is the consultant project manager and will oversee the consultant team. He added that he is very excited about the possibilities for this area. Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver, will oversee the project for the City of Vancouver. Bob Short represents Glacier Northwest, Inc. He emphasized that businesses located in Section 30 should be able to conduct their business until they deem they are finished. Judy Teitzel represents the Friberg property and said that the Friberg family will continue to live in the area for years to come. Nancy Bjornsen represents a portion of the English family properties and echoed Judy's comments. Alex Veliko represents Parks & Recreation and would like to see something similar to Butchart Gardens or a lake. David Nierenberg is a neighbor of Section 30 and represents his family.

Karyn previewed the agenda for the meeting including:

- 1. Project overview
- 2. Advisory Committee process and protocols
- 3. Existing conditions review
- 4. Definition of a successful subarea plan
- 5. Meeting close-out

1. Project Overview

John White briefly reviewed what is meant by the term subarea plan. Cities that are required to comply with the Growth Management Act (GMA) are entitled to develop subarea plans that can be adopted as part of their comprehensive plans. John added that the consultant team is not contracted to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this process. Because the subarea plan cannot be adopted until after completion of an EIS, the City and County likely will hold hearings on the subarea plan and accept it, followed by an EIS and the plan's formal adoption.

John discussed what this planning process is and is not about. Section 30 will be planned in the context of the next 50 years. It is important to set the conditions for long-term success in this area. Planning will encompass water, sewer, utilities, roads, and more. Though Section 30 is the primary focus, it needs to be planned in the context of its surroundings. John emphasized that it is critical to maximize—rather than cut off—long-term opportunities.

John explained that this planning process should not get in the way of any existing or planned businesses for this area. This process is in no way set up to run counter to existing operations. Its purpose is not to stop the East County landfill. The consultant team will look at the landfill as a given because it would be irresponsible to assume otherwise. The dispute over the landfill is a legal battle, and this process has no bearing on its outcome, nor is this process designed to impact any existing agreements between businesses and property owners. This group is not here to debate City or County policy that may support resource recovery; we will not question that policy.

John reviewed the project timeline. The consultant team intends to be finished by the end of the year. He noted significant dates in the process including:

- Design dialogue, August 26–27
- Open house, August 27
- Refinement of subarea plan, September–October

- Advisory Committee meeting #2, September 18
- Open house #2, September 24
- Advisory Committee #3, October
- Open house #3, October
- Refinement of preferred option, November–December
- Joint City and County work session, December
- Public hearings, January 2004

2. Advisory Committee Process and Protocols

Karyn reviewed the role of Advisory Committee members consistent with the Advisory Committee job description mailed to committee members. The role of the consultant team is to work with the Advisory Committee and public to develop the subarea plan to meet project objectives. The role of staff is to manage the consultants. The County is the project manager. Everyone agreed on the roles.

Karyn noted that all meetings will be open to public, but it is up to committee members to decide whether to allow public input at the meetings. The group decided to postpone this decision until later in the meeting.

Karyn discussed ground rules for the meetings and suggested three, including:

- everyone has an equal opportunity to participate
- come prepared to participate
- seek common solutions—look for answers rather than barriers

She asked the group if these were acceptable ground rules and asked if anyone would like to add to them. All agreed that these were acceptable and no additional ground rules were added.

Karyn asked if members of the committee would like to exchange contact information, and they agreed. A contact sheet will be distributed with the meeting summary; however, this information will not be released to the public.

John briefly discussed the real estate expert panel that has agreed to participate. This group of five or six real estate brokers and economists will advise on the feasibility of various uses to provide a real life assessment. He noted that a similar process used for the Esther Short Subarea helped increase public interest. He clarified that the panel will function in an advisory capacity and will not veto anything proposed by the committee.

3. Existing Conditions Review

Don Hanson, Otak, discussed existing Section 30 conditions, including current land uses, topography, and street classifications. He encouraged everyone to correct or add to what was on the maps. No one had anything to add at the time.

Joni Kartchner, committee member, asked the location of the proposed reclamation center and Don pointed to it on a map. Joni asked what the property owners would like to see done with their property. John responded that the project team is currently going through the interview process and it is not clear yet what property owners would like. John clarified that the next set of maps would include the footprint of the reclamation center. He added that the phasing of improvements would be important, because development will not occur at the same rate throughout the area.

Joni said she has interviewed over 100 residents about what they would like to see in this area. She has showed people pictures of Gresham Station and Orenco Station and has gotten positive responses.

Section 30 Page 3

Peter Coffey, DKS Associates, discussed what would be included in his analysis of the transportation system. It will include cars, bikes, and pedestrian traffic and transit facilities. He will look at 11 study area intersections. He is now collecting traffic data. Alex Veliko asked if the completed NE 192nd Avenue will be factored into the picture and Peter said it would be. He added that he would look into the future 20 years and include what is proposed and forecast for that period.

John asked committee members to provide information about Section 30 that project team members may not be aware of. He believes it is important to do as much homework as possible. David Neirenberg said that in terms of annexation, the group should examine the effects of annexation on Section 30. John said an annexation analysis is part of this process. The group discussed annexation in relation to mining and John explained the annexation prohibition agreements. These agreements prohibit the City from annexing the mining area for 15 years, starting in 1996, in part because the City does not have a mining ordinance that adequately provides for the extraction of mineral resources. Karyn noted that the City cannot annex the land unless the mining interests agree to relinquish the property earlier than the expiration of that 15-year period. Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver, added that the City has an annexation blueprint that specifies the order and timing of annexation; it will be updated following the Comprehensive Plan adoption.

Jim Schmid asked if there had been any discussion of a heavy rail system in this area. John said he had not heard of anything. The group also discussed the possibility of light rail in the area.

4. Definition of a Successful Subarea Plan

Karyn asked the group to respond to the following question: "When the subarea plan is completed, I would call it a success if it included _____ and my concerns about ____ were considered." A list of features needed for the plan to be a success follows:

- Mix of uses supported by all interests
- Increase in residential property values (Orenco/Gresham Station)
- Communities safely connected by parks and trail elements
- Good-paying jobs now and with redevelopment
- Reasonable, well coordinated transition plan
- Fair and inclusive public process leading to increased public support
- Butchart Gardens or some type of beautiful park
- Connectivity between Pacific Park and CTC
- Lake feature with mixed-use park-like setting
- Fire station
- Industry that is compatible with area
- Time-phased plan (who, what, when)
- Friberg residents will continue to exist
- English farm and vineyard will stay
- Adjacent English property transition from vineyard must be appropriate and unique
- Redi-mix will continue to operate/use aggregate
- Momentum beyond this process into implementation

A list of concerns that will need to be addressed follows:

- Time and budget (project completed on time and within budget)
- Ability to mine existing aggregates
- Existing uses (firing range/aggregate) meshed safely with neighbors
- Provide sufficient information for school and park planning

Section 30 Page 4

- Compatibility of Section 30 and surrounding area (well water in vicinity)
- Timing of infrastructure and capacity
- Safety of rifle range within area
- Adequate time to carry out plan
- Plan will not be completed
- Public safety training needs met in a fiscally responsive manner (rifle range)

Karyn summarized some of the themes she heard:

- All mining interests would like to finish extraction before redevelopment
- A mix of uses and an emphasis on job creation and parks and trails will be important
- Phasing/transition plan will be important

John encouraged mining interests to think long term beyond the end of extraction to what they would like to see develop.

5. Meeting Close-out

Karyn announced that the next Advisory Committee meeting would be in the student center at Shahala Middle School on September 18 [Please note that the September 18 meeting has been changed to Monday, September 15 from 6:00 - 8:00 pm at Camas Fire Station #42, located at 4321 Northwest Parker Street]. Karyn said the design dialogue is the next step and encouraged Advisory Committee members, their families, and others with a similar interest to sign up.

The group discussed whether to provide time for public comment at its meetings. It was decided that it would be allowed at the end of each meeting with some rules. The comment period will be limited to 10–15 minutes with each speaker limited to 3 minutes. Karyn emphasized that the intent of the comment period is for committee members to listen to the concerns of the speakers rather than to debate. Karyn proposed that public comment forms be available to attendees, and committee members agreed.

Judy Teitzel suggested that audience members be given the opportunity to provide input at the current meeting and other committee members agreed. Two audience members spoke.

Stacey Johnson from the Fisher Creek Neighborhood asked if attendees at the committee meetings would be able to see the Advisory Committee meeting notes. The group decided after discussion that the notes would be posted on the project web site.

Sarah Munson said she is delighted hear that there is planning taking place for this area. She is concerned that the area could become unsafe. Her biggest concern is the ability of the transportation system to support increasing density. She supports the idea of light rail, thinking that the area, because it is not near a major freeway, is landlocked.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Section 30 Page 5